UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/541,627 | 04/26/2006 | Alexandre Potier | 0659-1001 | 8285 |
| 466 YOUNG & TH | 7590 07/31/200 OMPSON | 9 | EXAM | IINER |
| 209 Madison St | | QUINLAN, RONALD A | | |
| Suite 500 ALEXANDRIA | A, VA 22314 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 4132 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 07/31/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

| | Application No. | Applicant(s) | | | | | |
|--|---|--|--------|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Occurrence | 10/541,627 | POTIER ET AL. | | | | | |
| Office Action Summary | Examiner | Art Unit | | | | | |
| | Ronald A. Quinlan | 4132 | | | | | |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply | ears on the cover sheet with the c | orrespondence ad | ldress | | | | |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONEI | J. nely filed the mailing date of this co D (35 U.S.C. § 133). | | | | | |
| Status | | | | | | | |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on | | | | | | | |
| | - action is non-final. | | | | | | |
| 3) Since this application is in condition for allowan | | | | | | | |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E. | x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45 | i3 O.G. 213. | | | | | |
| Disposition of Claims | | | | | | | |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>19-35</u> is/are pending in the application | 1. | | | | | | |
| · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. | | | | | | |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed. | | | | | | | |
| 6) Claim(s) is/are rejected. | | | | | | | |
| 7) Claim(s) is/are objected to. | | | | | | | |
| 8) Claim(s) <u>19-35</u> are subject to restriction and/or | election requirement. | | | | | | |
| Application Papers | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner. | | | | | | | |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). | | | | | | | |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152. | | | | | | | |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 | | | | | | | |
| <u> </u> | | (-1) (5) | | | | | |
| 12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: | priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a) | -(a) or (t). | | | | | |
| a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of: 1.□ Certified copies of the priority documents | s have been received | | | | | | |
| Certified copies of the priority documents Certified copies of the priority documents | | on No | | | | | |
| 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority | | · | Stane | | | | |
| application from the International Bureau | | a in this National | Olago | | | | |
| | * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Attachment(s) | □ · · · · · · · | (DTO 110) | | | | | |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 4) ∐ Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da | | | | | | |
| 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) Notice of Informal P | | | | | | |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date | 6) [Other: | | | | | | |

Application/Control Number: 10/541,627 Page 2

Art Unit: 4132

Election/Restrictions

1. Restriction is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 and 372.

This application contains the following inventions or groups of inventions which are not so linked as to form a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1.

In accordance with 37 CFR 1.499, applicant is required, in reply to this action, to elect a single invention to which the claims must be restricted.

Group I, claim(s) 19-29, drawn to a multi-layered structure comprised of graphite particles.

Group II, claim(s) 30-35, drawn to a method of manufacturing a multi-layered structure comprised of graphite particles.

2. The inventions listed as Groups I and II do not relate to a single general inventive concept under PCT Rule 13.1 because, under PCT Rule 13.2, they lack the same or corresponding special technical features for the following reasons: The technical feature which is common to both groups expressed in Claim 19 is disclosed by US 2002/0182387 to Mercuri et al., hereinafter referred to as "Mercuri". Specifically, Mercuri teaches the preparation of flexible graphite foil (page 5, paragraphs [0049]-[0062]). The graphite sheets are intercalated, i.e., expanded (page 6, paragraph [0059]), and then compressed to a desired thickness (page 7, paragraph [0061]). Composites with different characteristics, e.g., density and surface properties, by preselecting layers of different characteristics, e.g., density or void condition, to comprise the layers of the composite (page 8, paragraph [0069]). Mercuri further teaches a composite material wherein the top layer has a density suitable fro some embossing applications, e.g., between 0.1 and 1.4 g/cm³, while the bottom layer is relatively dense,

e.g., from 1.4 to 1.8 g/cm³. Therefore, since the limitations of Claims 19 and 30 fail to define a contribution over Mercuri they fail to constitute a special technical feature and hence there is lack of unity between the cited claims.

- 3. A telephone call was made to Benoit Castel on July 22, 2009 to request an oral election to the above restriction requirement, but did not result in an election being made.
- 4. Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include (i) an election of a species or invention to be examined even though the requirement may be traversed (37 CFR 1.143) and (ii) identification of the claims encompassing the elected invention.
- 5. The election of an invention or species may be made with or without traverse. To preserve a right to petition, the election must be made with traverse. If the reply does not distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election shall be treated as an election without traverse.
- 6. Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).
- 7. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims.

 Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and the product claims are subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise

Application/Control Number: 10/541,627 Page 4

Art Unit: 4132

require all the limitations of the allowable product claim will be considered for rejoinder.

<u>All</u> claims directed to a nonelected process invention must require all the limitations of an allowable product claim for that process invention to be rejoined.

8. In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103 and 112. Until all claims to the elected product are found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowable product claim will not be rejoined. See MPEP § 821.04(b). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution to require the limitations of the product claims. Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder. Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

CONCLUSION

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ronald A. Quinlan whose telephone number is (571)
 270-1149. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Thursday from 6:30am-4:30pm Eastern.

Application/Control Number: 10/541,627 Page 5

Art Unit: 4132

10. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Michael LaVilla can be reached on (571) 272-1539. The fax phone number

for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

11. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/R. A. Q./ Ronald A. Quinlan Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4132 July 29, 2009

/Michael La Villa/
Michael La Villa
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 4132
29 July 2009